	ed States Paten	T AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Patent and Address: COMMISSIONER F P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22: www.uspto.gov	-
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,446	09/18/2003	Takatomo Nishino	09792909-5672	4529
26263 7590 03/01/2007 SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			EXAMINER	
			DOVE, TRACY MAE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
011101100,12			1745	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE MA		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/01/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	. 10/664,446	NISHINO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tracy Dove	1745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet v	with the correspondence	e address
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. a reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of the ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	nis communication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\frac{1/3}{2}$	/07		
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		tters, prosecution as to	the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	•	•
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the applicatio	in.	· .	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		·
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.		•
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to th		-).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37	7 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I			. ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	-		
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document	nts have been received in <i>i</i>	Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	ority documents have beer	n received in this Natio	nal Stage
application from the International Bure	· · · · ·		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not	t received.	
		•	
ttachment(s)			
I) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		morman atent Application	

.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on 1/3/07. Applicants arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive. Claims 1-12 are pending. This Action is made FINAL.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon an application filed in Japan on 9/17/02. A claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since the United States application was filed more than twelve months thereafter. Examiner points out that while the preliminary amendment filed on 9/18/03 has amended to specification to recite "priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 is not claimed", the declaration/oath filed on 3/8/04 does not indicate priority is not being claimed (box on page 2 is not checked). Appropriate correction is required.

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claims Analysis

Claim 1 recites "formed as a result of applying a compressive force and a shearing force to at least part of a surface", which is not given patentable weight because it is a product-byprocess limitation. Claim 7 also recites this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/664,446

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawakami et al.,

US 6,432,585.

Kawakami teaches a battery comprising an anode, a cathode and an electrolyte. The anode comprises an anode structural body 10. The structural body comprises a host material 101 in am amount of 50 wt% of more. If the electrode structural body is used in a lithium battery, the host material comprises one or more elements selected from the group consisting of Si, Sn and In (11:1-18). When Si is used as the host material, Cu, Ni, Ag or Sn may partially cover the surface of the Si particles (11:30-67). Si may contain an impurity such as Al, Ca, Cr, Fe, Mg, Mn or Ni to decrease the electric resistance of the electrode material layer 102 (12:1-5). The layer 102 may comprise the host material 101 and an electrically conductive auxiliary in order to assist and

increase the electron conduction among particles of the host material or that between the host material and the collector. It is preferred the electrically conductive auxiliary be contained in an amount of 1-30 wt%. The electrically conductive auxiliary may be a carbonaceous material such as acetylene black, ketjen black or graphite. The electrically conductive auxiliary may be in a filament-like, fibrous or needle-like form. The host material and carbonaceous material are mechanically mixed using a ball mill or the like (compressive/shearing force) (12:46-13:9). See also column 19, line 50-column 20, line 23. See also Example 12.

Thus the claims are anticipated.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al., US 6,413,672.

Suzuki teaches a lithium battery comprising an anode, a cathode and an electrolyte. The anode comprises an anode material containing 50-99 wt% of silicon and 1-50 wt% of carbon material (abstract). It is preferable that silicon exists in the form of particles and the particles are covered with the carbonaceous material. A material containing a high proportion of silicon provides a high capacity (2:52-67). An amount of 70 wt% or more of silicon is preferred (5:7-9). The carbonaceous material may be graphite, amorphous carbon (acetylene black) or a mixture thereof. For example, coke, natural graphite, artificial graphite, carbonized pitch or a mixture thereof may be used (5:16-22). Embodiment 1 teaches 28.5 parts by weight silicon and 7 parts by weight graphite were mixed and then processed in a vibration mill (compressive/shearing).

Thus the claims are anticipated.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al., US 6,171,725.

Suzuki teaches a battery comprising a positive electrode, a negative electrode and an electrolyte. The negative electrode includes a negative electrode material containing 30-90 wt% of silicon and 10-70 wt% of carbon (abstract). The carbon material may be cokes, graphite (artificial graphite) and the like (3:14-21). The silicon/carbon composite material preferably comprises 50-90 wt% silicon and 10-50 wt% carbon (3:22-63). Example 4 teaches silicon powder was mixed with graphite/pitch. After calcining, the solid material was roughly milled (compressed/sheared). Through dry milling, a silicon/carbon composite powder was obtained.

Thus the claims are anticipated.

*

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103(a) as being anticipated by Inoue et al., US 6,506,520.

Inoue teaches a negative electrode for a nonaqueous secondary battery comprising composite particles (abstract). The composite particles include a core phase A and an outer phase B. When phase A is Sn, phase B may be Sn-Fe, Sn-Zn, Sn-In or Sn-Pb. When phase A is Si, phase B may be Si-Co, Si-Ni, Si-Zn or Si-Al (Table 1). A conductive material may be contained in the negative electrode. Among conductive materials, synthetic (artificial) graphite, acetylene black and carbon fibers are especially favorable. The amount of conductive material in the negative electrode is preferably 1-30% of the negative electrode materials (composite particles) (5:50-6:3).

Thus the claims are anticipated. The claims are alternatively unpatentable because the courts have ruled that product-by-process limitations, in the absence of unexpected results are obvious. Inoue does not explicitly state a compressive and/or shearing force is applied to the negative electrode material, however, the negative electrode material of the claimed invention and the negative electrode of the prior art appear to be the same.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takami et al., US 6,350,544.

Takami teaches a lithium battery comprising a carbonaceous material as the negative electrode material. Example 6 teaches the carbonaceous material was prepared by adding magnesium silicide to mesophase pitch to prepare a homogeneous dispersion. The fibers were carbonized and then the carbonized product was milled (compressed/sheared) to obtain milled fibers. The milled fibers were graphitized to manufacture milled carbon fibers. The carbon fibers thus obtained contained 4% in atomic ratio of magnesium and 2% in atomic ratio of silicon (22:58-23:25). Thus the claims are anticipated.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/3/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts "the use of the compressive force and the shearing action to combine the base material and the Group 14 element apparently produces a material with fused particles with chemical properties different than its constituent ingredients by way of a mechanical and chemical reaction", which is not supported. Applicant's assertion about what "apparently"

happens is not convincing to overcome the prior art of record. The claimed anode material must be shown to be materially different than the anode material of the prior art. Applicant has not provided any evidence clearly showing the claimed material is materially different than the prior art material. The exhibits provided by the Applicant do not properly compare the claimed invention with the prior art of record. Furthermore, the present claims are not commensurate in scope with Applicant's argument regarding properties of the anode material particles.

Applicant states none of the cited references discloses or fairly suggest particles or a material resulting from the application of a compressive force and shearing action as claimed. However, this limitation is a product-by-process limitation that is obvious in the absence of unexpected results. The claimed material and the material of the prior art appear to be the same.

Furthermore, the mechanical mixing using a ball mill or the like of Kawakami appears to result in compressive and shearing forces. The mixing in a vibration mill or roughly milling of Suzuki '672 or Suzuki '725 appears to result in compressive and shearing forces.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracy Dove whose telephone number is 571-272-1285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00-7:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 27, 2007

PRIMARY EXAMINER